In re: Premera Proposed Conversion Bellingham Public Hearing

BEFORE THE INSURANCE	CE COMMISSIONER		
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON			
01 1111 01			
In the Matter of the Application)		
regarding the Conversion and)		
Acquisition of Control of Premera Bl	Lue)		
Cross and its Affiliates.)		
) No. G 02-45		
PUBLIC HEARING			
BEFORE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER KREIDLER			
December 16	5, 2003		
at			
Hampton	Inn		
3985 Bennett	Drive		
Bellingham, Wa	ashington		
Taken Bei	fore:		
SUE E. GARCIA,	CCR, RPR		
Certified Court	Reporter		
of			
CAPITOL PACIFIC RE	EPORTING, INC.		
2401 Bristol (
Olympia, WA			
360.352.2			
e-mail: capitol@	ecallatg.com		
	creporter.com		
www.capitoipaciiic			
www.CapitoipaCiiic			
www.capitoipaciiic			

In re: Premera Proposed Conversion Bellingham Public Hearing

		Page 2
1	I N D E X	
2		PAGE
3	Mike Kreidler - Insurance Commissioner	3,33
4	Public Comment	
5	Dr. Gary Goldfogel	11
	Dr. Daniel Austin	14
6	Mr. Ron Snyder	15
	Mr. Scott Rhine	18
7	Dr. Julie Komarow	22
	Dr. Hugh Maloney	25
8	Ms. Connie Foulk	29
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 3 PROCEEDINGS 1 (6:16 p.m., December 16, 2003) 3 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Good evening. My name is Mike Kreidler. I'm the Washington State Insurance 5 6 Commissioner. And welcome to this hearing. The purpose of 7 the hearing is to hear about Premera's proposal to convert to 8 a for-profit company. This is an Office of the Insurance Commissioner Case No. G 02-45. And as I said, the purpose 10 here is to take testimony from the public relative to 11 Premera's proposal. Let me begin by introducing the parties. Over here to 12 my right you see Tom Wolfendale, who is outside counsel to 13 14 Premera. Next to him you see Yori Milo, who is the executive 15 vice president and chief legal counsel and public policy officer for Premera. And the OIC staff is represented by Jim 16 17 Odiorne, who is Deputy Commissioner for Company Supervision. And Ele Hamburger, who is here representing the intervenors 18 19 and -- in her capacity as part of Premera Watch; is that 20 correct? 21 MS. HAMBURGER: Yes, that is. COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: I would also like to 22 introduce Gubby Barlow who is here, who is the president and 23 24 CEO of Premera. Also participating here tonight to my left 25 we have Christina Beusch, who is assistant attorney general,

Page 4

who is assigned to my office as my counsel. Further, over there you have Sue Garcia, who is the court reporter. And standing ably at the door over here to my left you see Bill Ripple and Scott Schoengarth from public affairs in the Insurance Commissioner's office.

What I would like to do now is just briefly discuss kind of an update of where we're at in Premera's application, and following that the procedures for tonight's hearing.

Premera filed its -- what is referred to as a Form A filing with the Office of the Insurance Commissioner in September of 2002. They were asking for approval to convert to a for-profit company. If Premera was granted approval for conversion, they would then be owned by their stockholders, and it would be a publicly traded company. The value of Premera would be put over to a foundation to fund health needs of the public.

There are many laws that apply to a conversion, but the one that is the primary law which we operate under is the Holding Company Act, which is RCW 48.31B and C, which was extended to cover companies like Premera, health-service contractors, in the 2001 legislative session.

Early in 2001 I asked the legislature for authority to include in the Holding Company Act health-service contractors, and the legislation was adopted later that year in 2001. It contains the procedures for a review of this

Page 5

nature and the criteria for deciding whether to approve or disapprove an application for conversion.

Let me tell you a little bit about the progress that's been made since the initial filing was made by Premera back in 2002. We've previously held four public meetings, early after their application was filed, around the State of Washington. Premera has also filed a considerable amount of supplemental information in addition to their Form A filing as it was originally introduced.

The Office of the Insurance Commissioner staff itself, with the assistance of outside experts, have literally reviewed tens of thousands of documents. And I proceeded to also grant intervenor status to several organizations, the Washington State Medical Association, the Washington State Hospital Association, and the Premera Watch Coalition, among others. And they -- I can assure you they've all been taking a very active role in the proceeding.

We also have 17 different reports from a variety of experts that have been submitted. These include accountants, tax consultants, investment bankers, lawyers, and health-policy consultants. If you'd like to access those reports, I would suggest one of the most convenient ways would be to go to the Office of the Insurance Commissioner's website, which you can see right here in front of me, which is www.insurance.wa.gov. All of the expert reports are

Page 6

available on that website, and all of the hearing documents that have been filed by the parties are also available there, along with the 23 orders that I have issued up to this date.

We also have outside here a limited number of copies of the executive summaries of those -- of those reports that have been filed if you'd like to have a copy or would like to peruse them.

As you can well imagine, this activity has generated a fair amount of information, and it has been publicized in the media, particularly in newspapers. This case, I want to reassure you, is still very much in the information gathering stages. I have not received a recommendation from staff, no recommendations at this time, contrary to some published reports to the contrary. And I can assure you we won't be making -- I won't be making any decisions until the appropriate time.

Tonight's hearing is part of an adjudicative hearing. It is under the Administrative Procedures Act of the State of Washington. It in some aspects is certainly much like what would be analogous to a trial. I hear testimony, but I can assure you it's much less formal. I serve as the judge as a part of that process. And I will issue a decision after we've completed the entire process and I have all of the evidence that has been submitted and we've proceeded to kind of the -- one of the final stages, which is the formal

Page 7

adjudicative hearing.

The parties in this proceeding, I've introduced them. The principal parties here would be OIC staff review team, which is walled off virtually from me within my office legally to be separate from me so that they interact separately from me until they submit a response. Also you have the other major party, obviously, Premera, which submitted the application which is under review. And, of course, the intervenors have a special status of being able to interact on behalf of the public.

One of the things that's a little bit different than what you might have seen earlier is that last week I issued the 23rd order, which made it possible -- which extended the time period that's involved here. It now -- we are now looking at a process that will have a formal hearing that will begin on March 29th of 2004, and that may last for up to two weeks. And that's where the parties will offer testimony and documents and testimony as the parties that are involved in this case.

The times and location and details will be available for that site -- for this formal hearing, will be available on the OIC website. The final decision as in the schedule of the 23rd order is scheduled now to be rendered no later than June 7th for the final decision on Premera's application.

Page 8

As part of the public process, it wasn't required as a part of the obligations for reviewing an application -- was what I wanted to do which is to reach out to the public, and that's what this meeting is about. I scheduled -- as I mentioned, we did four meetings early in the process. This is the fourth of an additional four meetings that we've been conducting around the state.

Tonight is really your opportunity to provide testimony and comments on -- and I want to tell you that those comments will be treated as evidence. It is a part of the review as to what is in the public's interest, and I will certainly consider any information that you share with me tonight as a part of my decision-making process.

Let me tell you a little bit about how this meeting will work tonight. The testimony will be evidence in an adjudicative hearing. Everyone who testifies tonight must do so under oath. Everyone who intends to testify or will testify, I will ask you to raise your hand and be sworn in. I want to reassert to you that, again, this is informal, but there are some formal aspects to it. You are certainly very free to express your own personal opinions. You don't need to worry about the fine points of law or proving particular opinions that you might have. This is your opportunity to offer testimony, and it will be your recommendation to me.

Because tonight's hearing is part of an adjudicative

Page 9

hearing, the parties over here would have the opportunity to ask questions. I've asked the parties to please show serious restraint in doing that. They will have more than an ample opportunity in the formal hearing to present their cases when it takes place in March. However, if they do want to ask a question, I ask them to knock on the table or wave at me to make sure they get my attention so they do have that opportunity.

All of the -- all of the testimony and remarks are being recorded by our good court reporter, Sue Garcia, over here to my left. I'd ask you, when you do speak, to speak slowly and carefully so that she's able to record all of the information accurately on your behalf. The transcript of this meeting will be posted on the OIC website as soon as that information is transcribed and available, and that won't take very long.

I'm going to stress that this is formal, but it's a very informal process where you have an opportunity and really your opportunity to express your opinions on Premera's proposal conversion. You can talk about your experiences with Premera or with healthcare in general and other information that you might believe would be relevant to my decision-making process.

Once everyone has been sworn in, I will call one person at a time and the next person to testify. Actually, tonight I'll just call the one person since we won't have that many

Page 10 1 people testifying. I'll call the one person and ask you to come up, take a seat over here to my left, and ask you to 2 3 state your name and also where you live. Once we have finished people who have indicated a desire 5 to speak, there may be somebody else who did not sign up to testify but would have an interest to testify. I would just 6 7 ask you to step outside and to sign up to testify. 8 haven't been sworn in, I will do so when you come up here. But again, I would ask everybody here, unless somebody comes 9 in late, to -- if you think you might have an interest in 10 testifying to also be sworn in at that time so we wouldn't 11 12 have to repeat it after we've gone through the individuals 13 who signed up. At this point I'm ready to do the swearing in. 14 would ask everyone who wishes or might wish to testify to at 15 this time raise their right-hand. 16 17 18 GARY GOLDFOGEL, M.D., DANIEL AUSTIN, M.D., RON SNYDER, SCOTT RHINE, JULIE KOMAROW, M.D., CONNIE FOULK, 19 20 having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: 21 22 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you. And now I will 23 call the first name on the list, and we'll begin the hearing. 24 And, Gary, since you were the first one here, Gary, Dr. Gary 25 Goldfogel, just takes a second for me to say it.

Page 11 1 DR. GOLDFOGEL: It's taken me years to get it right. COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: You can be the first person 3 to speak. And again, just state your name and where you live for the record, please. 5 6 DR. GOLDFOGEL: Thank you, Commissioner Kreidler. 7 My name is Gary Goldfogel. I reside here in Bellingham. a practicing pathologist and the county's medical examiner, 8 and I'm the current president of the Whatcom County Medical 10 Society, former vice president of the Washington State Medical Association. 11 I'm here to speak against Premera's request to convert 12 to a for-profit entity. If Premera is permitted to convert 13 to a for-profit company, its focus will shift from making 14 15 health insurance available to Washingtonians to making a profit for its investors. That's what a company must do. 16 17 That shift will have far-reaching negative effects on patients, on employers, and on the physician community. 18 19 Critically needed services, including women's health, pediatrics, and care to older patients are put at risk as 20 21 these services tend to be costly for health insurers, that is, unprofitable. 22 23 Physician practices already shoulder hefty 24 administrative burdens in terms of staff labor and those 25 substantial costs when attempting to obtain Premera's

Page 12

authorization for medically necessary services. Clearly,

Premera as a profit-making company would seek to create

barriers to access, such as making the process for obtaining

permission for care a more daunting exercise.

I would also like to question Premera's above-average executive pay and speculate that salaries, bonuses, and insurance administrative costs would spike higher if the company is traded on Wall Street. It is my understanding that Premera made on the order of \$36 million in operating profits on \$2.6 billion in revenues last year. But where's the money coming from that funds this conversion? I expect it's coming from reserves withheld from policyholders, a questionable practice to say the least.

Physician practices, specifically, would suffer under Premera's new profit-oriented mission. The reimbursement rates that are paid do not cover the cost of services or the administrative costs borne by the practices. Many physicians already see the viability of their practices at risk. Should Premera be allowed to become a for-profit business, that viability could be further jeopardized. Some practices might close, and patients and our healthcare system would suffer.

The ability of physicians' practices to negotiate with Premera is not a level relationship given Premera's share of the insurance market, and in this community that's substantial. But by becoming a for-profit company, the fear

Page 13 is that Premera will grind down physicians' practices still 1 further through worsening reimbursement rates and unfavorable contract terms as Premera searches out ways to make a profit. 3 The conversions in other states have been disastrous to reimbursement schedules. Premera's profit status would raise 5 rates for policyholders and reduce payments to doctors, 6 clinics, and hospitals. 7 The North Puget Sound region would see devastating 8 effects from Premera's becoming a for-profit company. Our 10 region would see its physicians practices put at risk? Patients in lower income brackets and those with significant 11 health problems would also be at risk. Those patients are 12 not desirable to insurance companies from an actuarial point 13 14 of view. Premera would undoubtedly consider a departure from 15 Medicaid and state sponsored programs as we go forward. In closing, I oppose Premera's proposed conversion as 16 17 physicians' practices will suffer, our region's ability to maintain its network of physicians and our healthcare 18 19 infrastructure would be put in jeopardy. Premera will owe its allegiance to its investors, while potentially 20 21 sacrificing the healthcare needs of Washingtonians and eroding the healthcare delivery system. 22 23 Thank you for the opportunity to speak. 24 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Doctor. 25 Appreciate your testimony.

Let's see. Dr. Dan Austin.

DR. AUSTIN: My name is Daniel Austin. I'm a family physician here in Bellingham and also reside here in Bellingham. I am in a small group practice. I am a former president of the Washington Academy of Family Physicians.

I before you today to speak in opposition to the Premera conversion to a for-profit insurer for the following reasons:

The likely possibility that Premera would raise premiums to satisfy investors and thusly put a significant added burden on the healthcare costs paid for by consumers and employers;

The strong possibility that the same investor pressures would result in contracting practices resulting in decreased provider reimbursement, causing major detrimental effects on the delicate healthcare market. As family physicians in primary care, the financial viability of many of our practices is quite vulnerable right now. Even minimal decreases in reimbursement could seriously impact the availability of an adequate provider network for the citizens of Washington state, especially in primary care and in our rural areas.

Significant concerns about how the potential acquisition of Premera by an out-of-state insurer, such as Anthem, might effect those same contracting practices;

The prospect that potential financial gain for Premera's

Page 15 executives spurred their decision to seek the conversion and 1 honest doubts about whether Premera as part of its conversion would transfer the full fair-market value of the company into 3 a new nonprofit foundation as required by law. In summary, I believe the effect of the conversion of 5 Premera to be catastrophic and would potentially drive rural 6 7 providers out of those markets and cause a loss of access for consumers at a time when the state's safety net is stretched 8 to the breaking point. 10 Everyone but Premera, including the OIC experts, seems 11 to agree that Premera's plan is not in the public interest. It is obvious that consumers, patients, hospitals, and 12 healthcare providers will be harmed by any such conversion. 13 14 Commissioner Kreidler, I urge you to protect healthcare 15 workers, consumers, and hospitals and deny Premera's application to convert. 16 17 Thank you for hearing my testimony tonight. 18 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Dr. Austin. 19 Ron Snyder. 20 MR. SNYDER: Good evening. My name is Ron Snyder. 21 I'm a resident of the Everson area in Whatcom County. I am 22 unemployed; in other words, I'm retired. I'm an ex-public-health employee. And I have no pro or con position 23 24 on the Premera application. 25 I do -- I am familiar with some of the issues raised by

Page 16

some of my colleagues that relate to physician reimbursement, lack of support to hospitals in rural communities, executive pay. And I don't -- I don't have data that shows that to be true. Although, I have not investigated that either. It seems to me that would be easily available. These kind of conversions are not unknown in this country any longer Empire in New York, the North Carolina dropped out recently, and there are others as well.

It seems to me that it's very important for your office to make informed decisions based on some data that's substantial that holds water rather than speculation. It seems to me, too, that if there are uncertainties around physician reimbursement, which I think is critical, and rural hospital viability, that that's something that your office ought to look at seriously. And we hear words "negotiation." Why can that not be a part of a negotiations, some assurance that services will continue to be available?

I have a very, very high-risk daughter in Oregon who had to travel 150 miles one way for specialized OB care. And I've already heard that in Oregon a number of hospitals have closed because of the fiscal picture. And I know that Premera is in Washington and Alaska, but I think some of the same issues probably relate or pertain are present in Washington as well.

But I guess my encouragement is to use data, to use the

Page 17

experience of others, to not fall into people's fears and speculation in making some of the decisions that are going to be before you. Look at what's available.

If, in fact, the Premera conversion is approved, I know that there's the intent to establish a foundation with some of the assets, that -- well, I don't know the correct terminology -- there will be a foundation established. And I would encourage the Commissioner's office to also look at that, both the structure and some of the background that goes into establishing it, in thinking about public health.

Public health gets shortchanged repeatedly by medical care, and yet we're reading about flu, death with flu. We're reading about increased tuberculosis. We're reading about recurrence of other strains of diseases. We are looking at environment and health. That's public health. So I would ask that your office take a good look, you know, at some of the science and some of the data that's known around public health and some of the resources that are needed.

I can talk forever because I talk forever, but that's my comments for now. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Snyder.

Let me -- Mr. Snyder touched on it. Let me just mention that, relative to the issue of a foundation, that's an entity that would be created if approval for conversion were to be

Page 18

granted. Our office will play a very active role in determining the appropriate valuation of the assets that would be transferred to a foundation. But at the same time the actual set-up of a foundation, its activities, how it would be structured, largely rests with the Washington State Attorney General. So we have a very close working relationship if, in fact, approval for conversion is granted.

At that point then we work very closely with the Attorney General in taking the next steps of going through the process of how a foundation -- one, how much money and then the structure, which would be largely in the Attorney General's ballpark, just to give you some idea relative to a foundation.

I can also assure you that no decision will be made until we've had ample opportunity to review all of the information that has been submitted or testimony that has been given so that we make sure that all of the interests of the public are fully visited as a part of this deliberative process.

Next person to call upon would be Scott Rhine. Scott, if you'd just have a seat up here, please.

MR. RHINE: Good evening, Commissioner Kreidler.

My name is Scott Rhine. I'm an administrator and CEO at

Whidbey General Hospital. I've served in this capacity since

September of 1998, after serving a similar capacity in a

Page 19

public district hospital in the state of California for 11 years.

Having been recently elected as president of the Northwest Hospital Council, I'm representing tonight those 14 hospitals.

I believe that most healthcare is a local issue. Starts with the individual, and then when we as individuals need further assistance with a healthcare problem, we see others to assist in diagnosis and treatment. Capabilities to diagnose and treat have improved over the last 50 years, and the capabilities of technology have made marvelous progress and given most people the opportunity to experience better health and longer lives. And yet, we constantly face the issue of technology and capability outstripping our ability to pay for these services for everyone. That's the end of my philosophical statement.

Well, there are many important healthcare issues that are continuing to be addressed. The issue tonight is one of corporate autonomy, public good, and the impact on local communities.

As a council, we would support the need and the rights for entities to organize themselves to best accomplish their mission and purpose. Each of our own organizations feel that we have that right and responsibility. While we strongly prefer that Premera Blue Cross not become for-profit publicly

traded company, we feel that Premera Blue Cross should have the same right as any other corporation, as long as they do so in a publicly responsible manner.

The question then is: How does Blue Cross change their mission and organizational structure when they have relied on public support for over 50 years? This decision should be made carefully and with the input of legal and financial experts. However, there also needs to be input such as we are giving this evening, and ongoing input and participation from those who have contributed over the years. Premera Blue Cross should not control the foundation. We also believe that the mission of the new foundation should be dedicated to improving healthcare in local communities.

What will be the impact of the major for-profit insurance company in the communities represented by the Northwest Hospital Council? Hospitals, physicians, and other healthcare providers have experienced some challenging years in recent history. The operating margin for the 14 hospitals in the Northwest Council went from over 4 percent in 2001 down to less than 1 percent in 2002. Most of the smaller and rural hospitals are having even greater difficulty maintaining positive operating margins. Whidbey General, for example, had a negative margin last year. We do not believe that Premera Blue Cross's conversion to a for-profit organization will benefit local communities based on the

Page 21

information that is available.

Having worked for a for-profit healthcare company in the past, I know that their primary motivation has to be their financial shareholders. This is usually not considered over the long run, but in quarterly drives for better earnings. We do not believe the conversion to a for-profit status will lower healthcare costs in the communities that we serve. We see further emphasis on bottom-line results and higher premiums for employers and employees in order to produce expected investment returns.

All of the hospitals in the Northwest Council are either nonprofit or public hospital districts. Most hospitals in the state of Washington are unable to provide services in the same manner as for-profit healthcare companies. As hospitals, we serve the patients in our communities regardless of the patients' ability to pay.

As healthcare costs go up, fewer people will have the ability to purchase healthcare coverage. We do not believe that Premera's conversion will improve access to healthcare. In fact, it may jeopardize further some of the public programs they are participating in, especially in some geographic locations. We are not aware of any provisions proposed by the new foundation to increase access for those unable to purchase healthcare coverage.

Finally, we do not believe that the quality of

Page 22 healthcare in our local communities will be improved through 1 a for-profit conversion by Premera. Quality is improved through systematic planning and evaluation and follow-up in a 3 collaborative effort. The availability of resources also plays an important role in improving quality. Again, we do 5 not see increases in resources or better collaborative 6 7 efforts through a conversion to a for-profit Premera. With these reasons, we feel at this time that the Office 8 of the Insurance Commissioner should reject their application and in turn have them work on measured healthcare issues that 10 11 currently exist in a collaborative effort with hospitals, physicians, and other interested parties. Thank you. 12 13 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, 14 Mr. Rhine. 15 Next I would like to call on Dr. Julie Komarow. Hopefully I'm somewhat close on that. 16 17 DR. KAMAROW: You're close. COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: 18 Good. 19 DR. KAMAROW: I'm Julie Komarow, a family practice doctor currently in Covington, Washington. I appreciate the 20 21 chance to bring some testimony to you, Mr. Kreidler. I'm glad that you emphasized how informal this process 22 is suppose to be because I was up most of the night doing a 23 24 baby delivery. And because I was not in town last week to 25 discuss in front of you last week, I drove three hours to get

Page 23

here from Covington, so I'll do the best I can.

I feel really strongly about this, and I tend to speak in a more personal manner rather than a philosophical one. I have two major concerns about the conversion. And I speak very strongly against it. I've been a family practice doctor in Washington for nearly 20 years. The first years were in Everett, and I was, in the end, president of the Everett Family Practice Clinic, which died eventually, which is why I'm now in Covington.

Part of the reason that we became insolvent and had to close was because of third-party-reimbursement issues. We had the largest percent of Basic Health care, straight Medicaid, and Healthy Options patients in Everett when we closed. And I personally got to watch our nearly 20,000 patient population, which about 20 percent was in one of those programs, have to dig around for different doctors. And it was a very awful process to watch people go through.

And the people who are in the Medicaid -- different Medicaid and state programs had a much more difficult time, as you can imagine, finding physicians. And a lot of them just wound up in the emergency room getting care for a long time. I hope by now, two years later, a lot of them have found homes. But what is important is they have to have a insurance home to be able to belong to, and that conversion would really threaten.

Secondly, one of the hardest things that we ever did as a practice was to get angry enough at the poor reimbursement that Aetna was offering us to refuse to negotiate with them. And we shut down the part of our practice that saw patients that were insured by Aetna. That was a terrible year. We had patients that went away and found other doctors or didn't get care. And then finally we negotiated a better contract with Aetna; they were able to come back and see us again.

The reason I'm talking about Aetna is that if Premera becomes a for-profit organization, then it's going to have a much higher chance of becoming part of the national big group. It's going to be doctors like me wrestling with 1800-pound gorillas rather than 800-pound gorillas, and they will control a bigger and bigger part of the insurance business in the state. It's going to be impossible or very difficult for a practice to be able to say, "Your reimbursement is so low that it will harm our viability to stay with you. We aren't going to take your patients anymore."

So those are the two things: The poorest of our population need to have an insurance home, and doctors don't need any bigger gorillas to fight against.

So thank you for letting me speak.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,

Dr. Komarow.

	Page 25
1	Next, I would like to call Hugh Maloney. Do I
2	understand you didn't have an opportunity to take the oath?
3	DR. MALONEY: I did not.
4	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Let me administer it at
5	this time. If you would be kind enough it raise your
6	right-hand.
7	
8	HUGH MALONEY, M.D., having been first duly sworn
	testified as follows:
9	
10	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you. And if you
11	would be kind enough just to state your name and where you're
12	from.
13	DR. MALONEY: I'm Jim Maloney. I'm a physician
14	from Kent, Washington, at this time. Commissioner Kreidler,
15	I appreciate the opportunity to present some information.
16	I speak for myself. I'm a general internist. I take
17	care of adults and adolescents. I've been in Washington
18	state practicing medicine for over 26 years. I have had a
19	variety of experiences in rural medicine. I've been in a
20	solo practice for 10 years. I was in a small group practice.
21	I've been in a large group practice in downtown Seattle.
22	Currently, I'm a clinic chief at one of the clinics for the
23	University of Washington Physician's Network, which we are
24	the largest primary care organization in the region. I'm
25	here to speak against Premera's conversion to a for-profit

1 entity.

I believe if Premera's permitted to convert to a for-profit company, its focus will shift from making health insurance available to Washingtonians to making a profit for its investors. That shift will have far-reaching negative effects on patients, employers, and physicians. I believe critically needed services, including women's healthcare and care to older patients, will be put at risk as those services tend to be more costly for health insurers and, I believe, unprofitable because of that.

Physicians' practices already shoulder very hefty administrative burdens. Our costs for labor are going up in our offices. And those substantial costs increase when attempting to obtain Premera's authorization for what we believe to be medically necessary services. Clearly, Premera has a profit-making company would seek, I believe, to create barriers to access, such as making that particular process for obtaining permission a more daunting exercise.

I've been through this. It is very difficult, and it adds to the cost of service. I believe the scope of coverage would fall victim to the quest for profit. Premera would offer less and less coverage for what I consider necessary services while concurrently increasing premiums to folks such as myself trying to purchase it.

I believe pediatric preventive service might also be

Page 27

sacrificed. Patients would have to pay more out of pocket for more limitations on benefits. And I believe we're already seeing patients being disencouraged from seeking needed medical care in a timely manner. And I think this will end up with poorer healthcare status for citizens. Employers who purchase health insurance would be paying higher premiums, but I believe getting unhealthier employees.

Prescription drugs would be a target. Patients are already having to pay higher out-of-pocket costs, and I believe they're delaying -- we've seen evidence of this already -- delaying their prescription purchases or doing without medications altogether when they have to pay more out of pocket.

I believe physicians' practices and my practice will suffer if Premera's new profit-oriented mission is allowed to go forward. The reimbursement rates paid now don't cover the cost of services or many of the administrative cost borne by our practices. Many physicians already see the viability of their practices at risk. I believe should Premera be allowed to become a for-profit business, that viability of practice could be further jeopardized. I believe some practices would close; patients and our healthcare systems would suffer.

The ability of physicians' practices to negotiate with Premera is not a relationship with equals. Given Premera's share of the insurance market, Premera -- if Premera becomes

a for-profit company, my fear is that they will grind down physicians' practices still further. They'll do this through worsening reimbursement rates, unfavorable contract terms, as Premera searches for ways to make the necessary profit.

The North Puget Sound region would see devastating effects of Premera's for-profit status. Our region would see its physicians' practices put at risk. Patients in lower income brackets and those with significant health problems would also be at risk. These patients are not desirable to insurance companies from an actuarial point of view; they cost money. Premera would undoubtedly consider departure from Medicaid and Basic Health programs.

In closing, I do oppose Premera's conversion. I think our physician practices will suffer. I think our region's ability to maintain its network of physicians and our healthcare infrastructure would be put in serious jeopardy. Premera will owe its allegiance to its shareholders' desire for profit while sacrificing the healthcare needs of Washingtonians and further eroding our already tenuous care delivery system.

Commissioner Kreidler, thank you for the opportunity.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Doctor Maloney.

Dr. Maloney, was the last person to sign up. Is there anybody who had an interest in testifying this evening and had not signed up or would have an interest in signing up to

Page 29

testify? We have one right here. If you would be kind enough to -- do you want to sign her in right now, and then if you could come up just so that we have a written record of your testimony of your name for the record.

Did you have an opportunity to take the oath?

MS. FOULK: I did. I'm sorry I'm so casual. I sat down at ten minutes to 6:00, read the newspaper, and saw the ad, so I ran over here. So sorry I don't have texts like the folks did, but I do have some comments I would like to make.

My name is Connie Foulk, and I'm from Bellingham. I'm the HR manager at a local software company here in Bellingham. We have 117 employees. We've been with Premera for two years. Just paid a check to them today for \$46,000, which represents one month's worth of premiums for our company. So \$46,000 is a lot of money for us, you know; extrapolate that times 12 months.

And for us insurance coverage is a major issue for a lot of our employees, sometimes more important than just their compensation. We have had people that, when we hire them, it's important for them to know the type of benefits that we offer them as far as medical and dental because to them that's a priority for them. So when I talk about medical with my employees, you know, our main gist is to give them good quality coverage at fair amounts for them. Our company just pays for the employee's portion, and so the -- the

employees pay for their dependents.

But my biggest problem when we go out each year to get our quotes is we have no competitors. In Whatcom County there's basically only three companies that I can even go to, partly for the fact that we have 20 other employees that live in other states besides the state of Washington. So it's very difficult for me to hear that Premera is look at wanting to go for-profit because I feel that it is going to impact who we can go to.

Now, if I had 20 different companies that I could get quotes from, I would feel like, "Have at it. You guys do what you want," and I can go to someplace else." I don't have that advantage. I have two other places I can go to at this point.

Partly what I'm told by a broker is the fact that the state of Washington has lots of covenants that make it -- I guess our state is not as easy for different insurance companies to come in and quote us. And so I guess I feel, until our numbers improve where we have more competitors, we can't afford to let Premera go out to do this other item that they want to do.

We've seen increases. Two years ago it went up
17 percent. This last year it went up 21 percent. And my
best guess is that we've had -- in our particular company of
117 employees, we had two people that found out they had

Page 31

cancer this year. We had another employee that is having a foot amputated because of diabetes. And we have another employee that ran off the road coming to work and suffered three months' worth of not being able to come to work.

And I just know that when we get our quotes come
May 1st, it's going to be incredibly difficult for us to
maintain the same type of premium that we're paying right
now, which is \$288 a month for our employees.

Another thing that concerns me is one of my employees came with a letter from an OB/GYN practice here in Bellingham, a fairly large office, and the letter basically said that they would were no longer going to be accepting Premera as a carrier for the fact that they hadn't been able to negotiate good rates with them. They already paid bottom dollar. And when they sat down to negotiate, Premera said, you know, "We're not going to pay you one penny more."

So as of January 9th of 2004, all of our patients that go to this particular clinic will no longer be getting the same coverage, or they're going to have to either go to another doctor, or they're going to have to pay a lion's share of that visit.

There's not a lot of women in this room. But when you find an OB/GYN physician that you're comfortable with, you don't want to move. And so some of my women employees that work with me are feeling really concerned about this. And my

first reaction when I heard it was, "Oh, my gosh. We're getting to the point where we've got to start conserving those dollars because it's important for us to be able to save up for our shareholders, as opposed to what's best for the consumer, the people that are paying the premiums."

Also, the fellow that I mentioned that had the car accident, it's been a battle for him to get his money paid to the different services and the hospitals. And, you know, I look at his family, and I'm thinking, "Oh, my gosh, you know, they're just dealing with his recovery." His short-term memory is slow. His motor functions are slow coming back. It will be, you know, 6 to 12 months before he hopefully will be back to 100 percent. But in the midst of this, they're dealing with feeling like they're not getting their claims serviced or getting their answers to the questions they've posed.

So I feel that Premera has ample amount of people or -I don't know. I guess I just feel that Premera -- for the
most part I think is a solid company. And I just hate to see
them change their focus to stockholders as opposed people
that are paying the bills. And again, in Whatcom County,
with us being very limited to the different insurance
companies that we can even go to, I just don't want to see
Premera change their mode.

I think that's all I have to say. Thank you for your

Page 33 time. 1 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much. Again, Connie is the last person who signed up testify. 3 Is there anybody else? Seeing no one else here indicating a desire to speak 5 this evening, I want to thank you all very much for coming 6 and offering your opinion, your view, and your concerns about 7 the issue before the Office of the Insurance Commissioner, 8 which is Premera's application to convert to a for-profit 10 company. I will consider all of the testimony that was given as a 11 part of the official record, as a part of the adjudicative 12 hearing which we've conducted this evening. And there will 13 14 be the formal hearing coming up on March 29th, with the 15 final decision to be rendered no later than, according to the 23rd rule, by June 7th. 16 Again, thank you all very much for coming this evening 17 and helping me and helping your fellow citizens by 18 19 testifying. This meeting is adjourned. 20 21 (Proceedings concluded at 7:05 p.m.) 2.2 23 24 25

		Page 34
1	CERTIFICATE	
2	I, SUE E. GARCIA, a duly authorized Court Reporter and	
3	Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, residing at	
4	Tacoma, do hereby certify:	
5	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me on	
6	the 16th of December, 2003, and thereafter transcribed by me by	
7	means of computer-aided transcription, that the transcript is a	
8	full, true, and complete transcript of said proceedings;	
9	That I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or	
10	counsel of any party to this action or relative or employee of	
11	any such attorney or counsel, and I am not financially	
12	interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;	
13	IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and	
14	affixed my official seal this December 18, 2003.	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	SUE E. GARCIA, CCR, RE	PR
	WA Lic. No. 2781	